

REMARKS

Information Disclosure Statement

The applicant filed an information disclosure statement with the present application when filed including two references (US 5,930,358 and WO 99/45535). The examiner provided a copy of form PTO-1449 with initials indicating that US 5,930,358 had been considered, but did not initial the box indicating that WO 99/45535 had been considered. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests the examiner initial form PTO-1449 indicating WO 99/45535 has been considered and to include a copy of the initialed PTO-1449 with the next office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The examiner rejected claims 1-28 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Lenny et al. (6,600,614) in view of Watts (6,336,161). The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Regarding claim 1, the examiner asserts that Lenny discloses a disk drive comprising an interface for receiving a SMART command from a host computer, the SMART command comprising a sub command for transmitting setup data to configure parameters of the disk drive. This interpretation of Lenny is incorrect.

Although Lenny discloses, at col. 6, lines 18-36, a disk drive that receives a SMART command, the SMART command does not comprise a sub command for transmitting setup data to configure parameters of the disk drive. The SMART command disclosed by Lenny is a conventional SMART command, and at col. 6, lines 18-36, is the conventional "report status" SMART command received from the host computer wherein the disk drive merely returns to the host diagnostic information about the disk drive. The rejection should be withdrawn since Lenny does not disclose or suggest to modify a conventional SMART command so that it includes a sub command for transmitting setup

data from the host computer to the disk drive, or to configure parameters of the disk drive in response to the SMART command.

The benefit of using a SMART command to configure disk drive parameters, as taught by the applicant, is disclosed on page 1, lines 15+:

“A utility has been disclosed for configuring a write-verify error recovery operation from the host computer. However, this utility can only be executed after the host computer is ‘clean’ booted from a floppy disk so that the Microsoft Windows drivers are not installed. After running the utility to configure the write-verify operation, the host computer is rebooted into the Microsoft Windows operating system to resume normal operation.

Rebooting the host computer from a floppy in order to reconfigure a disk drive is undesirable since it precludes running the configuration utility from the more user friendly and familiar Microsoft Windows operating environment. In addition, it may be desirable to run the configuration utility from an Internet web page using an Internet browser program running under a Microsoft Windows operating environment. Still further, it may be desirable to reconfigure the disk drive on-the-fly relative to the type of application program running, or the type of data being manipulated. For example, it may be desirable to configure the error recovery system less stringently when storing Internet web pages in a browser’s cache as opposed to storing more critical word processing or accounting documents.”

Modifying a conventional SMART command, as recited in claim 1, to include a sub command for configuring parameters of a disk drive overcomes the above drawbacks to the prior art. Nothing in Lenny or Watts suggests a benefit for this modification to the prior art. The rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 3-11 disclose various disk drive parameters configured using a modified SMART command, including an error recovery system, a write verify system, and a cache system. Although the examiner asserts that Lenny discloses to configure similar parameters, this interpretation of Lenny is incorrect. Lenny does not disclose any details concerning the configuration of disk drive parameters. In contrast, Lenny discloses to enhance the SMART diagnostic reporting system by logging critical events to a critical event log (see Abstract). However, Lenny does not disclose any details concerning the configuration of disk drive parameters in order to configure such systems as error recovery, write verify, and the cache system. The rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 12-14 recite various embodiments for transmitting the modified SMART command to the disk drive, for example, through a graphical user interface, a user application program, or the Internet. Again, since Lenny does not disclose any details concerning the use of a SMART command to configure a disk drive, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The rejections of the remaining claims should be withdrawn for the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the rejections under 35 USC §103 should be withdrawn. In particular, the relied upon prior art does not disclose or suggest to modify a conventional SMART command to include a sub command for configuring parameters of a disk drive. The examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned over the telephone in order to resolve any remaining issues that may prevent the immediate allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/6/04

By: Howard H. Sheerin

Howard H. Sheerin

Reg. No. 37,938

Tel. No. (303) 765-1689

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on:

12/6/04

(Date)

Howard H. Sheerin

(Print Name)

Howard H. Sheerin
(Signature)